



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/712,399	11/14/2000	Matti Kiik	A33224-70015.0163	8464

21003 7590 03/12/2003

BAKER & BOTTS
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

AHMED, SHEEBA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1773

DATE MAILED: 03/12/2003

17

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/712,399

Applicant(s)

KIIK ET AL.

Examiner

Sheeba Ahmed

Art Unit

1773

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 December 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 1773

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicants response dated December 17, 2002 has been received and entered in the above-identified application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahluwalia (US. 5,965,257) in view of Meyer et al. (US 4,812,356).

Ahluwalia discloses a structural article comprising a substrate having an ionic charge coated with a coating having the same ionic charge wherein the coating consists essentially of a filler and a binder and wherein the coating does not bleed through the substrate (*meeting the structural article limitations of claim 1*). The substrate may be planar, coated on one or both sides with the coating (*meeting the limitations of claims 11 and 12*) and composed of fiberglass (*meeting the substrate limitations of claims 15 and 16*). The substrate is bonded together by a binder material composed of an acrylic latex and urea formaldehyde (*meeting the limitations of claim 23*). The binder may be acrylic (*meeting the binder limitations of claim 15*) and the filler may be fly ash, calcium carbonate, or ceramic micro spheres (*meeting the filler limitations*

Art Unit: 1773

of claim 15) (Column 3, lines 5-55). The structural articles may further comprise a water repellent material, an anti-fungal material, an anti-bacterial material, a surface friction agent, an algaecide and/or a flame retardant material (**meeting the limitations of claims 17-22**) (See claims 1-19 and Column 1, lines 66-67; Column 2, lines 1-25; Column 3, lines 52-65 and Column 4, lines 7-12). In a preferred embodiment, the article may be comprised of 10 to 25% by weight of glass fibers bonded together by 99 to 75% urea formaldehyde and 1 to 25% acrylic latex and the coating is 84 to 96% filler selected from fly ash, calcium carbonate or ceramic micro spheres and 4 to 16% acrylic binder material. The coating may further comprise SBR rubber that is crosslinked with the acrylic latex (**meeting the limitations of claims 24-27**) (See claims 13-16). The structural article may be of any shape and may be used in roofing applications (**meeting the limitations of claim 14**) and the article may be coated with conventional roofing coatings such as asphalt, modified asphalts or non-asphaltic coatings and the article may be further coated with roofing granules. Such roofing material is believed to be lighter in weight, offer better performance and fire resistance as well as better flexibility, dimensional stability and strength (Column 3, lines 34-52).

Ahluwalia do not disclose that the structural article may be coated with a heat reflective element.

However, Meyer et al. disclose a colored, highly elastic coating composition (**corresponding to the elastomeric coating of claim 2**) that may be used to coat substrates such as roofing (**meeting the limitations of claim 10**) (Column 1, lines 15-25). The coating comprises a colorant pigment (**corresponding to the coloring agent**

Art Unit: 1773

of claim 3) (Column 2, lines 10-15) that gives the coating a light and heat reflecting ability and a particular color (Column 5, lines 19-25). The coating is applied to the substrate is a thickness of at least 50 micrometers (***equivalent to 0.05 millimeters and thus meeting the limitations of claim 13***)(Column 6, lines 53-60).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to coat the structural article disclosed by Ahluwalia with the coating disclosed by Meyer et al. given that Ahluwalia suggest that their structural article may be coated when used in roofing applications and Meyer et al. specifically teach that their coating when applied to roofing materials leads to good resistance to sea water and chemicals and protects the substrate against degradation by the action of visible or UV light (Column 2, lines 33-38). With regards to the limitations of claims 4-9, the Examiner takes the position that the solar reflectance and the visible reflectance of the heat reflective coating disclosed by Meyer et al. is inherently between 65% to 100%, given that the chemical composition of the two coatings is identical.

3. Claims 1, 2, 10-12, and 14-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable Ahluwalia (US. 5,965,257) in view of Davies (US 5,691,033).

Ahluwalia discloses a structural article comprising a substrate having an ionic charge coated with a coating having the same ionic charge wherein the coating consists essentially of a filler and a binder and wherein the coating does not bleed through the substrate (***meeting the structural article limitations of claim 1***). The substrate may be planar, coated on one or both sides with the coating (***meeting the limitations of claims 11 and 12***) and composed of fiberglass (***meeting the substrate limitations of***

Art Unit: 1773

claims 15 and 16). The substrate is bonded together by a binder material composed of an acrylic latex and urea formaldehyde (**meeting the limitations of claim 23**). The binder may be acrylic (**meeting the binder limitations of claim 15**) and the filler may be fly ash, calcium carbonate, or ceramic micro spheres (**meeting the filler limitations of claim 15**) (Column 3, lines 5-55). The structural articles may further comprise a water repellent material, an anti-fungal material, an anti-bacterial material, a surface friction agent, an algacide and/or a flame retardant material (**meeting the limitations of claims 17-22**) (See claims 1-19 and Column 1, lines 66-67; Column 2, lines 1-25; Column 3, lines 52-65 and Column 4, lines 7-12). In a preferred embodiment, the article may be comprised of 10 to 25% by weight of glass fibers bonded together by 99 to 75% urea formaldehyde and 1 to 25% acrylic latex and the coating is 84 to 96% filler selected from fly ash, calcium carbonate or ceramic micro spheres and 4 to 16% acrylic binder material. The coating may further comprise SBR rubber that is crosslinked with the acrylic latex (**meeting the limitations of claims 24-27**) (See claims 13-16). The structural article may be of any shape and may be used in roofing applications (**meeting the limitations of claim 14**) and the article may be coated with conventional roofing coatings such as asphalt, modified asphalts or non-asphaltic coatings and the article may be further coated with roofing granules. Such roofing material is believed to be lighter in weight, offer better performance and fire resistance as well as better flexibility, dimensional stability and strength (Column 3, lines 34-52).

Ahluwalia do not disclose that the structural article may be coated with a heat reflective element.

Art Unit: 1773

However, Davies discloses a coating composition for coating surfaces such as roofs and containing aluminum pigment (Column 1, lines 11-15). The aluminum pigment imparts heat reflectance to the coating (Column 2, lines 10-20). The aluminum pigment may be the form of flakes (***meeting the limitations of claim 2***) (Column 2, lines 60-66).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to coat the structural article disclosed by Ahluwalia with the coating disclosed by Davies given that Ahluwalia suggest that their structural article may be coated when used in roofing applications and Davies specifically teach that their coating when applied to roofing material leads water and weather resistance and heat reflection (Column 5, lines 27-35).

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Art Unit: 1773

4. Claims 1-13 and 15-27 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-19 of U.S. Patent No. 5,965,257 in view of Meyer et al. (US 4,812,356).

Ahluwalia claims a structural article comprising a substrate having an ionic charge coated with a coating having the same ionic charge wherein the coating consists essentially of a filler and a binder and wherein the coating does not bleed through the substrate (**meeting the structural article limitations of claim 1 of the instant application**). The substrate may be planar, coated on one or both sides with the coating (**meeting the limitations of claims 11 and 12**) and composed of fiberglass (**meeting the substrate limitations of claims 15 and 16**). The substrate is bonded together by a binder material composed of an acrylic latex and urea formaldehyde (**meeting the limitations of claim 23**). The binder may be acrylic (**meeting the binder limitations of claim 15**) and the filler may be fly ash, calcium carbonate, or ceramic micro spheres (**meeting the filler limitations of claim 15**). The structural articles may further comprise a water repellent material, an anti-fungal material, an anti-bacterial material, a surface friction agent, an algicide and/or a flame retardant material (**meeting the limitations of claims 17-22**) (See claims 1-19). Claim 13 recites an article may be comprised of 10 to 25% by weight of glass fibers bonded together by 99 to 75% urea formaldehyde and 1 to 25% acrylic latex and the coating is 84 to 96% filler selected from fly ash, calcium carbonate or ceramic micro spheres and 4 to 16% acrylic binder material. The coating may further comprise SBR rubber that is crosslinked with the acrylic latex (**meeting the limitations of claims 24-27**) (See claims 13-16).

Art Unit: 1773

Ahluwalia do not claim that the structural article may be coated with a heat reflective element.

However, Meyer et al. disclose a colored, highly elastic coating composition **(equivalent to the elastomeric coating of claim 2)** that may be used to coat substrates such as roofing **(meeting the limitations of claim 10)** (Column 1, lines 15-25). The coating comprises a colorant pigment **(equivalent to the coloring agent of claim 3)** (Column 2, lines 10-15) that gives the coating a light and heat reflecting ability and a particular color (Column 5, lines 19-25). The coating is applied to the substrate is a thickness of at least 50 micrometers **(equivalent to 0.05 millimeters and thus meeting the limitations of claim 13)**(Column 6, lines 53-60).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to coat the structural article claimed by Ahluwalia with the coating disclosed by Meyer et al. given that Meyer et al. specifically teach that their coating leads to good resistance to sea water and chemicals and protects the substrate against degradation by the action of visible or UV light (Column 2, lines 33-38). With regards to the limitations of claims 4-9, the Examiner takes the position that the solar reflectance and the visible reflectance of the heat reflective coating disclosed by Meyer et al. is inherently between 65% to 100%, given that the chemical composition of the two coatings is identical.

5. Claims 1, 2, 10-12, and 14-27 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-19 of U.S.

Patent No. 5,965,257 in view of Davies (US 5,691,033).

Ahluwalia claims a structural article comprising a substrate having an ionic charge coated with a coating having the same ionic charge wherein the coating consists essentially of a filler and a binder and wherein the coating does not bleed through the substrate (**meeting the structural article limitations of claim 1**). The substrate may be planar, coated on one or both sides with the coating (**meeting the limitations of claims 11 and 12**) and composed of fiberglass (**meeting the substrate limitations of claims 15 and 16**). The substrate is bonded together by a binder material composed of an acrylic latex and urea formaldehyde (**meeting the limitations of claim 23**). The binder may be acrylic (**meeting the binder limitations of claim 15**) and the filler may be fly ash, calcium carbonate, or ceramic micro spheres (**meeting the filler limitations of claim 15**). The structural articles may further comprise a water repellent material, an anti-fungal material, an anti-bacterial material, a surface friction agent, an algacide and/or a flame retardant material (**meeting the limitations of claims 17-22**) (See claims 1-19). Claim 13 recites an article may be comprised of 10 to 25% by weight of glass fibers bonded together by 99 to 75% urea formaldehyde and 1 to 25% acrylic latex and the coating is 84 to 96% filler selected from fly ash, calcium carbonate or ceramic micro spheres and 4 to 16% acrylic binder material. The coating may further comprise SBR rubber that is crosslinked with the acrylic latex (**meeting the limitations of claims 24-27**) (See claims 13-16).

Ahluwalia do not claim that the structural article may be coated with a heat reflective element.

However, Davies discloses a coating composition for coating surfaces such as roofs and containing aluminum pigment (Column 1, lines 11-15). The aluminum pigment imparts heat reflectance to the coating (Column 2, lines 10-20). The aluminum pigment may be the form of flakes (***meeting the limitations of claim 2***) (Column 2, lines 60-66).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to coat the structural article claimed by Ahluwalia with the coating disclosed by Davies and to use the coated structural article in roofing applications given that d Davies specifically teach that their coating can be applied to articles so that such articles can be used as roofing material and lends water and weather resistance and heat reflection to the article (Column 5, lines 27-35).

6. Claims 1, 10, 11, and 14 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3 of U.S. Patent No. 6,500,560 B1 in view of Meyer et al. (US 4,812,356).

Kiik et al. claim a roofing assembly comprising a roofing underlayment comprising a substrate having an ionic charge that is coated on substantially all of one side with a first coating consisting essentially of asphaltic material and that is coated in the other side with a second coating having essentially the same charge as the substrate wherein the second coating consists essentially of a filler material and a binder material wherein the binder material bonds the filler material together and to the substrate and wherein the second coating does not bleed through said substrate (***meeting the coated structural article limitations of claim 1***).

Art Unit: 1773

Kiik et al. do not claim that their roof underlayment may be coated with a heat reflective element.

However, Meyer et al. disclose a colored, highly elastic coating composition **(equivalent to the elastomeric coating of claim 2)** that may be used to coat substrates such as roofing **(meeting the limitations of claim 10)** (Column 1, lines 15-25). The coating comprises a colorant pigment **(equivalent to the coloring agent of claim 3)** (Column 2, lines 10-15) that gives the coating a light and heat reflecting ability and a particular color (Column 5, lines 19-25). The coating is applied to the substrate is a thickness of at least 50 micrometers **(equivalent to 0.05 millimeters and thus meeting the limitations of claim 13)**(Column 6, lines 53-60).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to coat the roofing underlayment claimed by Kiik et al. with the coating disclosed by Meyer et al. given that Meyer et al. specifically teach that their coating leads to good resistance to sea water and chemicals and protects the substrate against degradation by the action of visible or UV light (Column 2, lines 33-38).

7. Claims 1, 2, 10, 11, and 14 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3 of U.S. Patent No. 6,500,560 B1 in view of Davies (US 5,691,033).

Kiik et al. claim a roofing assembly comprising a roofing underlayment comprising a substrate having an ionic charge that is coated on substantially all of one side with a first coating consisting essentially of asphaltic material and that is coated in

Art Unit: 1773

the other side with a second coating having essentially the same charge as the substrate wherein the second coating consists essentially of a filler material and a binder material wherein the binder material bonds the filler material together and to the substrate and wherein the second coating does not bleed through said substrate

(meeting the coated structural article limitations of claim 1).

Kiik et al. do not claim that their roof underlayment may be coated with a heat reflective element.

However, Davies discloses a coating composition for coating surfaces such as roofs and containing aluminum pigment (Column 1, lines 11-15). The aluminum pigment imparts heat reflectance to the coating (Column 2, lines 10-20). The aluminum pigment may be the form of flakes ***(meeting the limitations of claim 2)*** (Column 2, lines 60-66).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to coat the roofing underlayment claimed by Kiik et al. with the coating disclosed by Davies and to use the coated structural article in roofing applications given that Davies specifically teach that their coating can be applied to articles so that such articles can be used as roofing material and lends water and weather resistance and heat reflection to the article (Column 5, lines 27-35).

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed December 17, 2002 (Paper NO. 16) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahluwalia (US. 5,965,257) and

Art Unit: 1773

submit that the Ahluwalia reference cannot render the claimed invention obvious as the reference does not qualify as prior art. The Applicants state that the amendment of the claim for priority and the amendment of inventorship to add Mr. Ahluwalia remove the Ahluwalia reference as prior art.

The Examiner disagrees. The Ahluwalia reference has a filing date of August 14, 1998 and a publication date of October 12, 1999 both of which predate the priority date of November 30, 1999 of the instant application and hence Ahluwalia does in fact qualify as prior art. The Applicants are reminded that a prima facie case is made out under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) if, within 1 year of the filing date, the invention, or an obvious variant thereof, is described in a "printed publication" whose authorship differs in any way from the inventive entity unless it is stated within the publication itself that the publication is describing the applicant's work.

Furthermore, the Applicants have failed to address the double patenting rejections based on Ahluwalia.

Conclusion


9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sheeba Ahmed whose telephone number is (703)305-0594. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays and Thursday from 8am to 6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul Thibodeau can be reached on (703)308-2367. The fax phone

Art Unit: 1773

numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)305-5408 for regular communications and (703)305-3599 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)306-5665.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Sheeba Ahmed". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Sheeba Ahmed
March 6, 2003